

#12

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/842,234	Applicant(s) Nakayama et al.	
	Examiner Deepak Rao	Art Unit 1624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Deepak Rao (3) _____
(2) Mr. Arnold Turk, Applicant's Representative *AT* (4) _____

Date of Interview May 22, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Pending.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Turk referred to the "Background of the Invention" in the specification and presented arguments that the compounds can be used as 'preventive' agents. Also, he indicated that the specification discloses that the compounds can be used 'separately' (referring to page 19 of the specification). Examiner advised that the arguments will be considered favorably to advance the prosecution. Regarding the rejection under 35 USC 103, Mr. Turk directed attention to claim 25 and argued that the reference does not teach the use of a second antimicrobial agent and further, that the compounds have improved properties based on their ability to use as drug efflux pump inhibitors. Examiner indicated that the issues will be further considered based on the arguments submitted in an official response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Deepak Rao
DEEPAK RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1624

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required